

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed on May 1, 2008 has been reviewed, along with the art cited. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 20-22, 24-26, 28 and 30-34 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 26, 28, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,993) in view of McCullagh et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0022465).

Claim 1 recites, in part, “a processor coupled to the oscillator, wherein the processor is further coupled to receive *a status message* indicative of a quality level of the reference clock signal” and “a machine readable medium coupled to the processor, wherein the machine readable medium has instructions stored thereon capable of causing the processor to monitor *the status message* and to selectively place the phase locked loop in a holdover condition in response to *the status message*”.

None of the cited references teach or suggest this language. In particular, the Office Action makes references to monitor 26 of Johnson. However, Johnson clearly indicates that the monitor 26 of Johnson monitors the presence and accuracy of “an input reference frequency 10” itself and does not monitor “a status message indicative of a quality level of the reference clock signal”.

In order to expedite prosecution, claims 26 and 28 have been amended to recite “wherein the indicated quality level of least one of the primary reference clock signal and the secondary reference clock signal is determined based at least in part on a received status message.”

It is respectfully submitted that at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claims 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 26, 28, 33 and 34 as well.

Claims 10, 12, 13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,993) in view of McCullagh et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0022465), further in view of Ham, III (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0080901).

It is respectfully submitted that at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claims 10, 12, 13 and 15 as well.

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,993) in view of McCullagh et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0022465), further in view of Ham, III (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0080901) further in view of Baydar et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0097743).

It is respectfully submitted that at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claim 16 as well.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(a) as being anticipated by Johnson et al., (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,993).

It is respectfully submitted that at least the same arguments set forth above with respect to claim 1 apply to claims 17, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 30, 31, and 32 as well.

Serial No.: 10/087,610

Filing Date: 3/1/2002

Attorney Docket No. 100.152US01

Title: DIGITAL PLL WITH CONDITIONAL HOLDOVER

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1, 2, 4, 5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15-17, 20-22, 24-26, 28 and 30-34** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2008-07-30

/Jon M. Powers/
Jon M. Powers
Reg. No. 43,868

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg & Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731